

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are rejected in view of LIU and NEWMAN. Applicant maintains that the rejections are inappropriate for the reasons previously stated in the record. Nevertheless, in an effort to advance this case, applicant has amended the independent claims to more fully distinguish over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite that "the client public key is produced by a client computer in response to user supplied information, and wherein the client public key is delivered as an email message." Support for the amendment is found on page 11 of the specification and Figure 3, among other places.

NEWMAN relates to facsimile machines, not the claimed "client computer". Further, in NEWMAN the public and private key are "generated at the factory and stored within the individual fax terminal." (Column 4, Lines 43-44) Thus, NEWMAN fails to show or suggest producing a public key in response to user supplied information. Similarly, LIU fails to teach producing a public key in response to user supplied information.

Claim 1 also recites that the "client public key is delivered as an email message". The fax machines of NEWMAN rely upon dial-up connections to exchange information, not the claimed email message.

Claim 1 is further amended to recite the operation of storing the public key "after confirming user identification". Support for this amendment is also found on page 11 of the specification and Figure 3, among other places. LIU fails to show or suggest such an operation. Similarly, the NEWMAN fails to show or suggest such an operation.

Thus, the new amendments to claim 1 individually and in combination with the other limitations of claim 1 clearly distinguish over NEWMAN and LIU. Applicant's previous patentability arguments should be considered a sufficient basis for allowing this application, especially so in the context of these additional limitations that more fully distinguish over NEWMAN and LIU.

Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 should be in a condition for allowance. Claim 8 is amended to include limitations of the type discussed in connection with claim 1 and

therefore should also be in a condition for allowance, along with its dependent claims 9-14. Similarly, claim 15 is amended to include limitations of the type discussed in connection with claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-21 should also be in a condition for allowance.

In sum, all claims should be in a condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. If there are any residual issues that can be resolved with a telephone call, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Dated: July 8, 2005

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
Tel: (650) 843-5000
Fax: (650) 857-0663

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By: _____

William S. Galliani
Reg. No. 33,885